

# SCIENCE & GOVERNMENT REPORT

25th Year of Publication

The Independent Bulletin of Science Policy

Volume XXV, No. 11

P. O. Box 6226A, Washington, D. C. 20015

© June 15, 1995

## Q&A: Chairman Walker on Republican Science Policy

*Rep. Robert Walker (R-Pa.), Chairman of the House Science Committee, Vice Chairman of the Budget Committee, and longtime close friend and political confidant of House Speaker Newt Gingrich, spoke with SGR Editor Greenberg on June 7. Following is the text of the conversation, transcribed and edited by SGR.*

**SGR.** *You and your Republican colleagues say you're protecting basic science, but many scientists and their political friends say you're destroying it.*

**Walker.** It's the old order simply trying to defend a lot of pork-barrel politics that they put in place. We've been able to protect basic science, while going after those things which are basically politically derived science. They're screaming that by cutting those kinds of programs, it's having an impact on science. I would argue exactly the opposite.

**SGR.** *Have you had expressions of gratitude from the scientific community?*

**Walker.** We haven't had a lot so far, but it's beginning to

## Steady-State Funds for NIH? Director Says It Looks Worse Than That—P. 6

come in. I've had several letters within just the last day or two. I spoke to the New York Academy of Sciences over the weekend, where we had several universities represented. And there was an understanding that we had done a pretty good job of protecting basic science, and there was an appreciation for that.

**SGR.** *One exception would be the social, behavioral, and economic sciences—the SBE Directorate at NSF. You've created the impression that you intend to eliminate NSF's support for these disciplines.*

**Walker.** I think that it was probably a mistake in 1991 to put the Directorate in place [established at NSF under pressure from Congressional Democrats]. I agree with the point that [NSF Director] Neal Lane made to me in a letter recently [reported in SGR, June 1]. And that is the social sciences fit in with the overall mission of the agency related to the other sciences. I'm the first to agree that there's some anthropological work, for example, that can be done that has a valuable science application. We don't want to end that. But the fact is that, since the Directorate went into place, my feeling is that too much of the priority had been switching toward doing behavioral sciences as almost a separate category, rather than seeing it as a part of the totality of the mission of the agency. We want to do a course correction on that.

(Continued on Page 3)

## Federal Research Agencies Facing Cuts, Terminations

With the Republican make-over of government in high gear, formerly unthinkable and painful prospects have quickly become routine fare in Washington's science-policy deliberations.

Biomedical research, only recently grudgingly reconciled to staying level in purchasing power, is beginning to realize that its fiscal fortunes will almost surely fall below the steady state—which now looks like nirvana. The extent of the budget decline is not certain. But as Harold Varmus, Director of the National Institutes of Health, points out [P. 6] huge reductions may lie ahead.

While the Congressional friends of health research remain vocal in their support, the money pool from which NIH derives its funds in the appropriations process is shrinking.

(Continued on Page 2)

## In Brief

**Hotlines:** With huge budget cuts looming, the space agency has established the "NASA Headquarters Downsizing Rumor Control Hotline" (202/358-3767) to field questions from staffers worried about their jobs. Callers are asked to leave a recorded message, anonymously, if they choose, but with name and number if they want a reply. The distinction of rumors at NASA is that they all turn out to be true.

**For psychiatrists concerned with the rush to managed care, which usually limits services and pays less, the American Psychiatric Association has a hotline, too (1/800-343-4671), on which members are invited to report "problems relating to the structure of managed care systems," as well as success stories.**

The House authorization bill for the Department of Energy doesn't contain any money for US participation in construction of Europe's next big particle accelerator, the Large Hadron Collider, at CERN. But that's only because no agreement has yet been worked out between the US and CERN, according to Rep. Dana Rohrabacher (R-Calif.), Chairman of the Science Committee's Energy and Environment Subcommittee. Rohrabacher indicated that he's sympathetic to international cost-sharing on big-science projects.

**In the longest-running case on the scientific-misconduct docket:** The appeal of misconduct findings against Thereza Imanishi-Kari, of Tufts University, opened as scheduled on June 12, with a full day of testimony—the first of at least 23 reserved for the case by the Departmental Appeals Board of the Department of Health and Human Services [SGR, June 1]. An attorney in the case told SGR that he doesn't expect a decision until February.

## ... Coming Up: "Commerce Dept. Dismantling Act"

(Continued from Page 1)

Last year, a total of \$70 billion was allotted to the House Subcommittee that votes funds for NIH's parent Department of Health and Human Services, plus the Departments of Labor and Education. This year's allotment for the three departments is \$60 billion.

The National Science Foundation—at least those parts of it outside the social sciences—is basking in Republican adulation of basic research as a proper function of government. But the kind words for NSF do not translate into a financial bonanza in Congressional budget planning, which provides for a 3 percent increase next year, and then no increase to the year 2002. Chairman Bob Walker (R-Pa.) of the House Science Committee appears to be pretty much alone in his cheerful insistence that inflation of scientific costs can be washed out by wise fiscal policies and frugality.

Recognizing that in hard times it has been comparatively well treated, NSF is taking the line that science is, and should remain, a non-partisan undertaking. While NIH's Varmus has been warning of biomedical catastrophe, the NSF leadership is prudently quiescent on fiscal matters. NIH, of course, can count on Congress's own health anxieties and the raucous medical and patient lobbies to support its financial aspirations. NSF's base of support isn't as broad or deep and lacks the connection to heartfelt issues.

Foundation officials have dutifully protested the clobbering of their programs in the social, behavioral, and economic sciences—but softly. SBE, as it's called, has never been a full-fledged member of the NSF family. The three fields share a total of \$85 million out of NSF's \$3.1 billion. The Directorate in which they're housed was pushed on NSF in 1990 by Congressional Democrats, prominent among them then-Rep. Doug Walgren (D-Pa.), who said, "NSF's enthusiasm for the behavioral and social sciences is at best lukewarm."

The degree of acceptance has indeed improved. But with the budget knives flashing, neither NSF's leaders nor its major clients in the "hard" sciences are inclined to tangle with the reigning Republicans in defense of the social sciences. Chemistry or physics might be another matter.

Circulating in the Senate is a legislative proposal bearing the endorsement of Majority Leader Robert Dole: "The Commerce Department Dismantling Act of 1995," which proceeds from the premise that the Department "cannot be 'reinvented.' Its problems can only be solved if it is dismantled, including its several scientific and technical agencies," says an accompanying letter inviting Senatorial support.

The much-reviled Advanced Technology Program of the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) would be terminated, but what would happen to NIST's own inhouse laboratories and their historic role in setting technical standards? According to the Dismantling Act, NIST's "weights and measures functions" would be transferred to the

### A Blast at "Trendy Science"

Rep. Dana Rohrabacher (R-Calif.), a top rhetorical brawler in the Republican House majority, last week denounced "trendy science that is propped up by liberal/left politics," and declared that "there is a new gang in town" that will terminate "nonsensical" programs.

Rohrabacher, Chairman of the Science Committee's Energy and Environment Subcommittee, fired off his assertions as he unveiled an authorization bill designed, he said, "to get back to the basics, funding essential productive scientific research." The bill would whack about \$1.5 billion from the Department of Energy's current budget level, with the reductions concentrated in environmental research, solar energy, fusion, and other programs long popular with the ousted Democratic majorities.

"Nowhere is scientific nonsense more evident than in global warming programs that are sprinkled throughout the current year budget," Rohrabacher said. "Our FY96 budget does not operate on the assumption that global warming is a proven fact. In fact," he declared, "it is assumed at best to be unproven and at worst to be liberal clap trap, trendy but soon to go out of style in the 'Newt' Congress."

National Science Foundation. Another Commerce agency, the National Technical Information Service, would be privatized, while the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration would be cut up, terminated in parts, with surviving pieces privatized or distributed to other federal agencies.

NASA, slated by the White House and Congressional Republicans for major budget reductions, is talking seriously about privatizing the Space Shuttle by turning its operations over to a contractor who would be paid by NASA. Would this save money or increase efficiency? With no evidence to suggest either, the apparent advantage is the appearance of doing something, sensible or not, in line with the anti-government mood now raging in Washington.

#### © 1995, Science & Government Report, Inc.

Editor and Publisher

Daniel S. Greenberg

Associate Publisher

Wanda J. Reif

Circulation Manager

Glen D. Grant

Published by Science & Government Report, Inc., twice monthly, except once each in January, July, August, and September. Annual subscriptions: Institutions, \$455.00 (two years, \$780.00). Bulk and individual rates upon request. Editorial offices at 3736 Kanawha St. NW, Washington, DC 20015. Tel. (202) 244-4135. For subscription service: PO Box 6226A, Washington, DC 20015. Tel. 1-800-522-1970; in Washington, DC 785-5054. Reproduction without permission is prohibited. SGR is available on University Microfilms International. Claims for missing back issues will be filled without charge if made within six weeks of publication date. ISSN 0048-9581.

# ... Sees NSF "Course Correction" in Social Sciences

(Continued from Page 1)

**SGR.** Does that mean the SBE Directorate gets abolished, but SBE research continues elsewhere at NSF?

**Walker.** Yeah. We would continue to do social-science work, as we have traditionally done at NSF. But the social-science work would be in light of what the overall mission of the agency is.

**SGR.** When you said that some of the work there has been "politically correct," did you have anything specific in mind?

**Walker.** I didn't really have specifics in mind, except that my perception of what has happened—. I'm a social scientist. That's where my academic background is. [Walker attended William and Mary College in 1960-61, received a BS in education from Millersville (Pa.) State College in 1964, and a master's degree in political science from the University of Delaware in 1968. He taught briefly before serving as a Congressional aide from 1967 until 1976, when he was elected to Congress.]

**SGR.** What kind of social scientist are you?

**Walker.** I'm a social-studies major, and concentrated primarily in political science, but also did work in sociology, anthropology. I have some backgrounding in that area. But my view of where this was headed [at NSF] was toward a series of studies that did not relate to questions that arise in the general science community, and that too many of those seemed to have a political context to them; that when a study was finished, it appeared as though it was being done with the idea that it would be a good document to be used politically.

**SGR.** For a political purpose?

**Walker.** Yeah. And that's true of nearly anything that happens in economics and a lot of social sciences. They tend to have at least some degree of opinion connected with them, and that opinion ends up being political fodder.

**SGR.** Do any examples come to mind?

**Walker.** The one that I know has been under discussion, and I'm not certain how much work has been done, is on the field of violence—of how we are going to measure violence, and so on. That just raises some red flags with me, because I think that, depending upon what direction you take that work, it could end up scientifically justifying—so-called scientifically justifying—a particular theory about how violence occurs.

**SGR.** Is violence a legitimate subject of research?

**Walker.** It is a legitimate subject of research. I'm not certain that when you are prioritizing money at NSF, it ranks along with some other areas. And particularly, depending upon how that was categorized, the question is whether or not it is more political or scientific.

Neal Lane and I just had a conversation this morning, and he makes the point that some of the work that they've been doing, for instance, in trying to understand the quality revolution [in manufacturing and services] obviously involves some engineering questions, but it also involves some

culture questions. It involves some questions about how people are integrated into that, and those are sociological in nature there; that any complete study of the quality revolution probably needs to have the social and economic side and behavioral side woven into it. That's where I think that the SBE is legitimately woven into what NSF is doing.

**SGR.** But without a separate Directorate for SBE.

**Walker.** That would be my preference. And in large part, what we were doing with the budget priorities was simply sending a message to NSF that we think that, insofar as there has been a prioritization shift toward that since the [SBE] Directorate came in place, that we ought to go back to the more traditional mode of integrating those rather than prioritizing them as a separate stream. But we're going to continue. The [Science Committee's NSF] Subcommittee in its markup will have some money in there that will be for SBE.

**SGR.** The amount of money for SBE is relatively small—\$85 million out of NSF's \$3 billion plus. Is it worth all this fuss?

**Walker.** I'm not certain that we understood that we were going to kick up as much fuss as we did over it. Of course, anytime somebody has a stream of government money coming their way, they get to kick up a fuss if they think it's going to be ended. But I viewed it, and I think the others who were also concerned viewed it, as a way of saying to the National Science Foundation that we think that your priorities in this area have been misplaced and we want a course correction. I think as a result of what we're doing, we're getting the course correction.

**SGR.** In the budget resolution, the increases for the basic sciences were predicated on funds that otherwise would have gone to the social, behavioral, and economic sciences.

**Walker.** What we say is that if you're going to get the 3 percent increase for basic sciences, it's money that we saved in the social sciences account. If you integrate the social sciences with the physical sciences, then you lose that. Lane makes a very strong point, and it's one that I tend to agree with. It's that the integration of those two is often necessary for them to be able to do their work well.

**SGR.** If they survive on an integrated basis, those funds would not be available for the physical sciences.

**Walker.** If they survive at the same level. But that's going to be a judgment call we're going to leave up to NSF. If you integrate those sciences along with the others, the money will still be available, depending upon how the National Science Foundation wants to prioritize it. They're going to have to make that judgment, based upon scientific merit. If they regard the social sciences as bringing in a program which is of far greater merit than the physical sciences programs that they have before them, that would end up being their judgment.

**SGR.** Given Republican opposition to the Advanced Technology Program [ATP] in the Commerce Department,  
(Continued on Page 4)

## ... Indications of Political Favoritism in NIST Awards

(Continued from Page 3)

why has there been no discussion of the Small Business Innovation Research Program [SBIR], which involves even more money than ATP in its "set-asides" for industrial research [about \$800 million this year for SBIR, nearly double ATP funding]. Isn't SBIR "corporate welfare," too?

**Walker.** In a sense I suppose it has some of that context to it. The fact is, though, that they tend to be relatively small contracts and it does, in fact, have a lot more of the entrepreneurial aspects to it than some of the big corporate subsidy kinds of things that were happening in these other programs. It's something that, in all honesty, we haven't thought a lot about. It's not one that has been up on my radar screen. I'm sure that there have been some abuses there that probably we ought to look at in some context. What we were primarily again concerned about doing was trying to change the direction of so-called R&D money. I happen to believe that the ATP program is not only wrong from the standpoint of the government picking winners and losers, but I think it has a very, very big political context to it.

**SGR.** Do you mean the money is being given as a political favor to unworthy recipients?

**Walker.** I don't know that it's quite that crass. But there are some indications that the flow of money ended up going to companies that tended to be good political contributors, tended to go into areas that were represented by the people from the right political party, and so on. We're doing a fairly extensive study of ATP, and the more we find out about it, the more it has some tinges of political context rather than good science.

**SGR.** Do you mean political payoffs from companies in return for ATP awards?

**Walker.** As I say, maybe "payoff" is too harsh a word. But it becomes increasingly clear that the companies that have reaped a lot of benefit out of this tend to be people who have been actively involved in the political structure. And then you get anecdotal kinds of things that come in. I'm fascinated by the money that ATP has put out for air conditioning, for example, that ended up going to the big three firms in air conditioning to essentially do upgrades on present technology. When there's evidently at least one company out there that has done some very revolutionary things that was frozen out of even competing for the ATP money. But it's a small company. Now, interestingly enough, the big three have all now contracted with this small company to get some idea of what their revolutionary new process is about. But ATP didn't think that was worthy of its investigation or even allowing the company to compete. It gives me the feeling that this is more designed to be attractive to corporate America than it is attractive to people who are entrepreneurial and inventive.

**SGR.** What are the names of these companies?

**Walker.** It's Trane, Carrier, and York—they are the three companies that were the recipients of the ATP money.

The small company is Engelhard/ICC [of Philadelphia].

[In response to an inquiry from SGR, an ATP spokesman said a competition in refrigeration technology was announced last fall, and that the announcement of awards is expected in July or August. So far, he said, no awards have been made.]

**SGR.** Does your opposition to the ATP program extend to NIST's core laboratories?

**Walker.** I happen to be a big-time defender of the NIST core program and the core labs. Because I think that setting standards in a global economy is very necessary. And so I tend to be somebody who believes that NIST's core labs are one of the things that the federal government does best.

**SGR.** The Pentagon's Technology Reinvestment Project is getting the ax, though DOD says it helps enlarge the technology base for both civilian and military needs. Isn't there some plausibility to that argument?

**Walker.** Sure. I think that's absolutely the case. Defense and NASA and a lot of other people ought to be shopping in the consumer marketplace for a lot of their products. The question is whether or not you need to have a government program, a spending stream, aimed at helping those companies to come up with defense-related products. Or whether Defense and NASA and other agencies need to simply be more careful consumers and understand what's in the marketplace that will be of value to them. I think a lot of the work that should be done toward accessing the commercial marketplace for the good of defense is simply logic.

I don't think you need bureaucracies and command structures for these decisions. If there's a good truck available in the commercial marketplace, why not just go out and buy the good truck? Why do you have to design the truck from ground up? There are all kinds of things that agencies over the years have gotten used to doing themselves where now you can actually buy better, and in many cases more up-to-date, products on the commercial market.

**SGR.** In the budget resolution, the lines that were extended to the year 2002 do not take into consideration the bite of inflation. Inflation is a reality, but the numbers remain flat for several major science agencies. Why doesn't your budget planning give science protection against inflation?

**Walker.** First of all, we think that by balancing the budget and taking the government out of the equation and putting money into the economy, that inflation rates can be held down substantially so that it will be less of a factor than it has been in the past. Second, we also think we're going to have a very large impact on interest rates, so that some of the expenses that accrue to enterprises, for instance, in building facilities and so on, will be lessened and give them more money to put in the programs. Third, the experience of every major business that has gone through the kinds of changes we are trying to bring about is that they develop significant efficiencies, somewhere in the range of 25 percent and more.

(Continued on Page 5)

## ... Tight Budgets Can Boost Efficiency, Walker Says

(Continued from Page 4)

We think that it's time for government and the programs it sponsors and the programs that are dependent on government to achieve some of those same efficiencies, too. We think that by extending out essentially flat [budget] lines, we will force some of those efficiencies into these programs in the same way that business and industries have had to react in the country. We realize that that's not easy. But on the other hand, we also know it's possible. And there's no reason to believe that we won't end up with more effective programs as a result of stabilizing the money, but with the understanding that our priority is to take government out of some of this decision making.

**SGR.** Do you think there are efficiencies to be obtained, for example, in a university-based chemistry-research project?

**Walker.** Yeah. By taking some of the regulatory burden off them. If we reduce some of the paperwork burden that now goes with it, that in fact could end up being a major savings within the program, which means that more money can actually go to the research and less money go to the overall structure. And so, if you look at our proposal, what we are suggesting is not only a flat [budget] line; we're also suggesting that we're going to back off on a lot of the paperwork and regulatory nonsense that we tie to that money.

**SGR.** You're suggesting that in the year 2002, when the NSF budget has been approximately level at \$3 billion for the preceding five or six years, NSF could, in effect, have more purchasing power than it has today—if all these good things happen, such as regulatory reform?

**Walker.** I think what we hope is that they will have similar purchasing power to what they presently have, and that will be reflective of the fact that their purchasing power was substantially increased in the late '80s. One of the judgments we made when we looked at the science budget was, at the end of this decade, will these programs—if we think they're good programs—be in relatively the same shape as they were at the beginning of the '90s? Understanding that at the beginning of the '90s, they were in their best shape in history. Our calculation is that if we reduce the regulatory burden, if we achieve some efficiencies, if, in fact, we hold down inflation, we do the things that we think are all positive benefit, that we will maintain these programs in essentially the same status as they had when they went into the '90s.

**SGR.** The inflation rate is now low—2-3 percent. Do you think it will get lower than that?

**Walker.** I don't think that there's any reason to think that it can't get somewhat lower. Productivity in the economy is going up enormously. Most of the inflation is from the unproductive dollars being put in by government in vast deficit numbers. If you begin to lower those deficits, with the increased productivity of your society, you can actually drop back the present inflation rate.

**SGR.** Why is the Space Station one of the rare federal programs that's not being cut?

**Walker.** In large part, because NASA has defined that as being its priority. Second, the Administration has defined it as being its priority. And third, if you believe as I do, that manned space is an important part of the survival of the space program, it is absolutely essential.

**SGR.** On other matters, you do not accept the priorities of the agencies or the Administration. Why is space different?

**Walker.** In part, because some months ago, I made an agreement with the President of the United States that I would do what I could to make certain that the Space Station moved forward.

**SGR.** Why such a high value on the Space Station?

**Walker.** Because I think that it is a valuable national resource for our future. It is an investment in leading-edge technology. We are learning a lot, in everything from life sciences to robotics as a result of the work that we're doing in preparation for the Space Station. I believe that it will be the most unique laboratory in the world when it's completed. I tend to believe that we will probably have at least a Nobel Prize and maybe several that will be won from being able to do experimentation in that unique laboratory. The rest of the world is going to look at whether or not we are able to follow through on this big international project, as to whether or not they're going to cooperate with us on other kinds of big-science international projects. So, if we fail in this effort, it will be disastrous. And finally, I believe that the particular association with the Russians is very, very important, because I think the collapse of this agreement could have a major political consequence internally in Russia.

**SGR.** Is there a place for the national labs in your scenario for the future?

**Walker.** At least in the short term there is. Because what we brought together there is some integrated teams with a lot of advanced technology that I think certainly have a role to play in some of the technological transformations taking place. One of the things we're going to have to take a look at is whether or not we need all the labs we now have, and what their mission is. Certainly, it's a place where the culture has to change some. Because, once again, they have been necessarily insular, because they were doing largely black-box work. They have tended to formulate teams that have stuck together and haven't moved in and out of the whole society.

I would like to see us utilize them far more effectively, with people coming into them, spending some period of time utilizing all of the resources that are available there, and then taking that knowledge back out into society. I think there needs to be a cultural change in any of those labs that end up surviving. The real question then becomes, how much of that we need. I think that's something we're going to have to sort out. We're not sorting that out in this budget year, but at some point, we're certainly going to have to.

## Varmus Calls Budget Plans "Prescription for Disaster"

*From an address, "Biomedical Research Enters the Steady State," delivered May 20 as the annual Shattuck Lecture, by Harold Varmus, Director of the National Institutes of Health, to the Massachusetts Medical Society.*

It is now possible to make a diagnosis: the research enterprise is making a painful transition from an era of growth to an era of steady-state activity. In the steady state, new grants can be funded only when old grants expire, new faculty can be hired only when older faculty retires, and new NIH programs can begin only when other programs are ended....

Still, none of us like to acknowledge that the end of growth has occurred. I continue to ask the Administration at the beginning of each budget cycle for a request that would restore healthier success rates [for grant applicants]. Our many constituencies go to Congress each year hoping for substantial increases in appropriations for NIH. And many universities continue to build facilities for biomedical investigators who will be expected to amortize the buildings with new grants.

But during the past year, and especially during the past week [when long-range Congressional budget resolutions proposed major reductions in NIH funding], such ambitions have come to seem quixotic at best. Would it not be more sensible to put our energies into optimizing scientific life in the steady-state environment that is likely to persist for the foreseeable future?...

We could recommend how lab groups should be configured in the stable world. For example, groups might be smaller, with fewer trainees and with more technicians possessing advanced degrees, and these smaller groups might be obliged to work together through research consortia to achieve efficiency and technical diversity. Going further, we could try to determine the right number, sizes, and types of grants in our portfolio. It has even been suggested that we designate a subset of the current 1700 NIH grantee institutions as principal recipients of our support.

To raise such questions may be a useful means to focus attention on our problems, but I worry about a solution to our predicament that sounds like a planned economy.... Supporters of science must inevitably weigh stability against competition. I believe that American science has profited greatly from competition based on expert review and that science in other countries has often been penalized by premature offers of life-long support. If we are to think concretely about the steady-state world, as I believe we must do, it will be important to guarantee that a healthy level of competition remains in it. Still, the competitive mode has its limits, and we may have now reached them.

It is also far from clear that we are equipped with either the will or the knowledge to envision, let alone determine, the correct shape of biomedical science at steady state. Such planning is not consistent with our national traditions or with

### Taking the Pulse of NIH

It remains to be seen whether or how the Varmus regime will reinvent NIH, but it surely is subjecting the place to presumably deep examinations, conducted both inhouse and by specially appointed outside groups of researchers and administrators. The probings, in a sense, pick up where the prior Healy regime left off with its megalomaniac Strategic Plan, which was bottled up by the Bush White House for fear of its big-spending implications. The Varmus studies, however, were spawned by the demands of penury, and are designed to squeeze more from less.

Among the recent output: a generally negative review of the intramural program of the National Cancer Institute, which was deemed too big and too inbred by a committee chaired by Paul Calabresi, of Brown University, and Michael Bishop, UC San Francisco.

Another study, conducted under the chairmanship of Marvin Cassman, Acting Director of the National Institute of General Medical Sciences, concluded that the NIH Division of Research Grants was too remote from the rest of NIH in its role as manager of the study-section system. In the works: a study of clinical research, chaired by David G. Nathan of Harvard.

the accepted values of our field....

To this point, I have considered the state of biomedical science from the optimistic perspective that we can accommodate to constant rather than expanding support from government.... But, during the past two weeks, those of us who have followed the Congressional Budget Committees have learned that NIH funding could actually be reduced in the next fiscal year. "Less" might really mean "less." Moreover, funding might be frozen at these lower levels, while inflation continues, for several additional years, until the national budget is balanced in 2002....

The House Committee proposes to reduce the NIH budget for FY96 to a level 5 percent below the FY95 level, that is, 9 percent below the steady-state-maintaining 4 percent increase that the Clinton Administration has proposed for 1996. The Senate Committee's plans [later rendered less harsh in a floor vote], if adopted, would reduce our budget by 16 percent, 20 percent below the Administration's number.

The effect of all these proposals would be highly destructive. If we honor our commitments to current grantees, the Senate proposal would allow us to fund no more than a few hundred new grants in FY96, rather than the usual 6000 to 7000, even if we reduce the size of other programs. We could increase the number of new grants by reducing payments to those who already hold grants, but the situation inevitably deteriorates: by the year 2000, our spending power would be about 40 percent below current levels.

In any form, this is a prescription for disaster.

## In Print

(Continued from Page 8)

**From the Engineering Workforce Commission of the American Association of Engineering Societies:**

**Engineers: A Quarterly Bulletin on Careers in the Profession** (16 pp., sample copy free; \$15 a year for members of affiliated organizations; \$25 for others; add \$10 for foreign orders), the second issue of this newcomer, dated April, reports on job markets, salaries, enrollment trends, degrees awarded, etc.

Order from: American Association of Engineering Societies, 1111 19th St. NW, Suite 608, Washington, DC 20077-5703; tel. 1-800/658-8897, or 202/296-2237; fax 202/296-1151.

**From the World Resources Institute (WRI):**

**Green Ledgers: Case Studies in Corporate Environmental Accounting** (180 pp., \$19.95, plus \$3.50 for shipping), case studies on profits and other benefits derived from closer attention to environmental issues and costs at major corporations, including Amoco Oil, Ciba-Geigy, Dow Chemical, and Du Pont. WRI is a Washington-based, non-profit environmental research center.

Order from: WRI Publications, PO Box 4852, Hampden Station, Baltimore, Md. 21211; tel. 1-800/822-0504, or 410/516-6963.

**From the Commission on Professionals in Science and Technology:**

**Comments** (eight times a year, 32 pp., \$70 annually for Commission members; \$90 for others), consists mainly of summaries, from numerous publications, concerning S&T employment, education, government activities, etc. The institutional membership of the Commission consists of professional societies and high-tech corporations.

Order from: Commission on Professionals in Science and Technology, 1333 H St. NW, Washington, DC 20005; tel. 202/326-7080; fax 202/842-1603.

**From the US Department of Energy, Office of Industrial Technologies:**

**Technology Partnerships: Enhancing the Competitiveness, Efficiency, and Environmental Quality of American Industry** (140 pp., no charge), reports on DOE's research and cost-sharing collaborative programs for promoting energy efficiency in firms in various industrial sectors, including steel, petroleum, chemicals, food processing, etc.

Order from: National Renewable Energy Laboratory, Document Distribution Service, 1617 Cole Boulevard, Golden, Colorado 80401-3393; tel. 303/275-4363; fax 303/275-4053; e-mail evanss@tcplink.nrel.gov

**From the National Academy of Sciences (NAS):**

**Ward Valley: An Examination of Seven Issues in Earth Sciences and Ecology** (212 pp., \$39, plus \$4 for shipping), a cautiously favorable nod in behalf of the site nominated for a low-level radiation-waste dump, in the Mojave Desert of

southeastern California, 20 miles from the Colorado River. The study was spawned by concerns about leakage and other environmental issues expressed in 1993 by three members of the US Geological Survey, and was conducted for the Department of the Interior by a specially appointed committee chaired by George A. Thompson, Professor emeritus of geophysics, Stanford University. With two of 17 members expressing some reservations, the committee concluded that transfer of contaminants from the site to the water table is "highly unlikely," but it urged further study. The report states that the committee "was not asked to and did not take any position" on the site's suitability for nuclear-waste disposal.

Order from: National Academy Press, 2101 Constitution Ave. NW, Washington, DC 20418; tel. 1-800/624-6242, or 202/334-3313.

## Job Changes & Appointments

**Lawrence Rudolph**, on the legal staff of the National Science Foundation since 1988, has been appointed General Counsel of NSF. He had been in the job on an acting basis since February 1993.

**Michael Armacost**, a former US Ambassador to Japan and currently a fellow at Stanford University, has been appointed President of the Brookings Institution, one of the biggest and oldest policy-research centers on the Washington landscape. He succeeds **Bruce MacLaury**, who is stepping down after 18 years in the presidency.

**Karl Stauber** was confirmed by the Senate on May 23 and sworn in on the next day as Under Secretary of Agriculture for Research, Education and Economics, thus filling a post vacant from the beginning of the Clinton Administration. Two previous choices dropped out after delays and confusion in the clearance process. Stauber previously was Vice President of the Northwest Area Foundation, in Minnesota.

## To Order or Renew

Science & Government Report  
Northwest Station, Box 6226A  
Washington, D.C. 20015

☐ Renew my subscription ☐ Enter my subscription

Institutional subscribers: one year, \$455.00 ☐  
two years, \$780.00 ☐

Non-USA airmail, \$35.00 per year; non-USA surface  
mail, \$15.00 per year additional

☐ Check enclosed ☐ Please Bill

Please charge to: ☐ MasterCard ☐ VISA

Account# \_\_\_\_\_ Exp. date \_\_\_\_\_

Signature \_\_\_\_\_

Name \_\_\_\_\_

Address \_\_\_\_\_

Zip \_\_\_\_\_

**Toll-Free Subscription Service: 1-800-522-1970**  
**In Wash., D.C.: 785-5054 / FAX: (202) 362-2790**

# In Print

Official reports and other publications of special interest to the research community

(Copies of publications listed here are available from the indicated sources—not from SGR)

**From the Congressional Office of Technology Assessment (OTA):**

**Agriculture, Trade, and Environment: Achieving Complementary Policies** (GPO Stock No. 052-003-014-2; 241 pp., \$16), says US agriculture is burdened by antiquated government policies that neglect worldwide shifts in consumer tastes and sales opportunities, while plodding on with the production and export of unprocessed, bulk commodities. At the same, OTA states, agriculture's response to environmental concerns consists mainly of anti-erosion programs, with little attention to broad systems approaches that encompass water, land, and wildlife. While research budgets are concentrated on increasing agricultural production, OTA says, relatively little is spent on studying foreign markets or the environment, to the detriment of the US farm economy. Michael J. Phillips was Project Director for the report. (For a free 8-page summary: 202/224-8996).

**The National Space Transportation Policy: Issues for Congress** (GPO Stock No. 052-003-01415-7; 114 pp., \$9), warns that US policy for developing technologies for getting into space is weighed down by conflicts over civilian and military roles, weak responses to foreign competition for launch business, and uncertainty in the private sector. These and related issues were supposedly addressed in the National Space Transportation Policy issued last August by the Clinton Administration, but OTA tags that effort as foggy and insufficient. Noting that the White House has not supplanted the Bush Administration's statement of space policy, OTA says, "Without a clear articulation of space policy and how it relates to the broader national agenda, it may be difficult for both industry and government to pursue space transportation goals with vigor." Christopher Waychoff served as Project Director. (Free summary: 202/224-8996).

**Cost and Effectiveness of Prostate Screening in Elderly Men** (GPO Stock No. 052-003-01414-9; 144 pp., \$9.50), finds that research is inconclusive on whether systematic, early prostate screening extends life, but suggests that Medicare patients be given the opportunity to make an informed decision about whether to undergo testing. The report, extremely reserved about the utility of testing, notes that largescale clinical trials now in progress may resolve the uncertainties. Michael Gluck was the Project Director.

The reports summarized above may be among the last to come out of OTA, targeted for termination by Congressional Republicans. Last week, OTA's House Appropriations Subcommittee voted to discontinue funding as of October 1. The final verdict isn't in, but a reversal is unlikely.

**Order from:** New Orders, Superintendent of Documents, PO Box 371954, Pittsburgh, Pa. 15250-7954; tel. 202/512-1800; fax 202/512-2250.

## SGR Summer Schedule

The next issue of *Science & Government Report* will be published July 15, 1995.

**From the University of California, Los Angeles:**

**Reinventing the Research University** (294 pp., \$45), proceedings of a national meeting last June at UCLA, with 130 participants, from academe, non-profitland, and industry, including the usual contingent of frequent flyers on the science-policy circuit. A summary by Roland W. Schmitt, former President of Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, says, "There was no systematic attempt to develop a comprehensive set of recommendations corresponding to the main themes that emerged from the symposium." Among the "suggestions and ideas" cited by Schmitt: "Develop better skills and policies for working with industry," "New ideas need to be generated and fostered to strengthen the links between research and undergraduate education," and "Find new approaches to the issues of accountability and allegiance". With the published proceedings gushing of earnestness, and the handwringing almost audible, a question arises: Wouldn't beleaguered academe be better off if these sages stayed at their posts? Maybe not.

**Order from:** Candi Salto, Assistant to the Vice Chancellor for Research, UCLA, 2138 Murphy Hall, Box 951405, Los Angeles, California 90095-1405; tel. 310/825-7943; fax 310/206-4997. (Checks payable to: Regents, University of California.)

**From the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS), Office of Research Integrity (ORI):**

**Annual Report: 1994** (33 pp., no charge), summarizes events on the HHS misconduct front, including judicial decisions concerning ORI procedures, findings of misconduct (with a dozen miscreants identified by name and institution), plus data on numbers of cases, academic rank of accused and accusers, and outcomes. ORI also reports on its "assurance program," which aims to beef up integrity defenses at the local level, and outside studies in progress on commission from ORI, including one on the effects of accusing and another on being accused of misconduct.

Though debate about scientific misconduct rises and falls—it's now in a lull—the actual numbers coming out of the integrity mill remain small: in 1994, 26 investigations were "closed," the report states, with ORI conducting 8 of them, and the rest handled locally, for a total of 11 misconduct findings or administrative actions. Bigger numbers reside in the Public Health Service ALERT system, ORI's scientific dishonor roll, which, as of last December 31, listed "172 individuals sanctioned for scientific misconduct or violation of FDA regulations governing research." The ALERT list is supposed to tip off agencies about shady applicants.

**Order from:** Office of Research Integrity, Suite 700, 5515 Security Lane, Rockville, Md. 20852; tel. 301/443-5300; fax 301/443-5351.

(Continued on Page 7)

